

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 02/23/2004

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. Ryoichi Mukai 0671.66045 5134 12/07/2001 10/008,713 EXAMINER 02/23/2004 24978 7590 RICKMAN, HOLLY C GREER, BURNS & CRAIN 300 S WACKER DR PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT 25TH FLOOR CHICAGO, IL 60606 1773

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

*		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/008,713	MUKAI, RYOICHI
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
·	Holly Rickman	1773
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the d	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be ting within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed /s will be considered timely. If the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 25 N	ovember 2003.	
2a)⊠ This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)□ This action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 2,10,12,14 and 15 is/are pending in the 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) ☐ Claim(s) 2,10,12,14 and 15 is/are rejected.  7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine		+
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).		
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		
<ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority document</li> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea</li> <li>* See the attached detailed Office action for a list</li> </ul>	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applica rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	tion No ved in this National Stage
A44h(a)		
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summar	y (PTO-413)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail [	
LS Patent and Trademark Office		400

Art Unit: 1773

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. The rejection of claim 2 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the abstract of JP 5-101933 is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.
- 3. The rejection of claim 12 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Coffey et al. (US 5989728) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.
- 4. Claims 12 are 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Kubota et al. (English translation of JP 64-79919).

Kubota et al. disclose a method of making a magnetic recording medium by laminating a non-magnetic Cr underlayer and a magnetic layer having Co alloy magnetic layer on a substrate followed by annealing such that Cr is diffused from the underlayer into the crystal grain boundaries of the magnetic (see page 5 and Ex. 1). The reference discloses ten alloys which may be used for the Co based magnetic layer including CoPt (see p. 7, first full paragraph). It is the Examiner's contention that the group of disclosed alloys is small enough that one of ordinary skill in the art would immediately envisage an embodiment of the invention using CoPt.

Art Unit: 1773

With respect to the limitation of claim 14 requiring that no bias voltage be applied to the substrate, it is noted that the reference does not describe the application of a bias voltage to the substrate and furthermore, the examples given use a non-conductive (glass) substrate which would preclude the application of a bias voltage.

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 6. The rejection of claims 2 and 10 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Endo et al. (US 4774130) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.
- 7. The rejection of claim 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Coffey et al. (US 5989728) in view of Ataka et al. (US 5939202) is withdrawn in view of Applicant's amendments.
- 8. Claims 2, 10, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kubota et al. (English translation of JP 64-79919).

Kubota et al. disclose a magnetic recording medium having a substrate a non-magnetic Cr underlayer and a magnetic layer having Co magnetic grains with non-magnetic Cr grain boundaries (see page 5 and Ex. 1). In example 1, the thickness of the Cr underlayer is 500 Å

Art Unit: 1773

(i.e., 50 nm). The reference is silent with respect to the particular amount of Cr that is present in the Co magnetic layer. However, the reference does teach that Cr is diffused from the underlayer into the crystal grain boundaries of the magnetic layer thereby improving coercive force by reducing the size of each "magnetic zone" (see p. 6, lines 1-2).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to determine the optimal amount of non-magnetic Cr to add to the Co magnetic layer in order to achieve optimal coercivity. Such an optimization would have been well within the purview of one of ordinary skill in the art since it has been held that discovering an optimum value of a result effective variable involves only routine skill in the art. *In re Boesch*, 617 F.2d 272, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA 1980).

# Response to Arguments

- 9. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim2, 10, 12, and 14-15 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 10. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 1773

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Holly Rickman whose telephone number is (571) 272-1514. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Paul J. Thibodeau can be reached on (571) 272-1516. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Holly Rickman Primary Examiner Art Unit 1773

hcr

February 13, 2004